DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 176 SP 035 695

AUTHOR Darling-Hammond, Linda
TITLE Standards for Teachers. 34th Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-126-0
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (46th, Chicago, IL, February 17, 1994).
AVAILABLE FROM AACTE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 ($10 members, $12 nonmembers, plus $2.50 for postage and handling).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Leadership; Reflective Teaching; School Restructuring; *Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

ABSTRACT

Teacher educators and teachers must be leaders in developing learner-centered standards for preparing teachers. Standards can help teachers build their own knowledge and understanding of what helps students learn. As schools undergo restructuring, teachers will be responsible for students, not just subject-matter information; for understanding how learning is occurring; and for having tools to assess how students learn and think as well as what they know. Teachers will also be responsible for curriculum development, assessment, decision making about special needs of students, and reaching out to parents from different communities. Licensing requirements and teacher evaluation requirements generally do not focus on this conception of teaching. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is setting standards that reflect the real complexities and real judgments that teachers must deal with. Teachers' development of materials to be submitted for Board certification and teachers' reflection upon their teaching are powerful professional development activities. The goal should be to create, use, reflect upon, operationalize, and enliven standards in a way that produces learning. This kind of work among teachers can lead to the development of a profession that can take ownership and leadership for creating and using an expanding base of knowledge to serve all children well. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 176

34th Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture

STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS

Linda Darling-Hammond

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

AACTE 46th Annual Meeting
Chicago, Illinois
February 17, 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Lewig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP035695

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

34th Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture

STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS

Linda Darling-Hammond

Teachers College, Columbia University

AACTE 46th Annual Meeting
Chicago, Illinois
February 17, 1994

The Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture at AACTE's 1994 Annual Meeting and publication of this document were supported in part by a grant from the people of Chevron U.S.A., Inc.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The author was encouraged to express her judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of
Standards for Teachers
may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186

Single copy (prepaid) $10 for AACTE members, $12 for nonmembers. Add $2.50 for postage and handling.

Copyright © 1994 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-126-0

CHARLES W. HUNT

1880-1973

With a passion for teaching and a love of people, Charles Wesley Hunt helped shape teacher education in America for nearly half a century. His career spanned the range of educational responsibilities —teacher, university dean, president of the State Teachers College at Oneonta, New York, and volunteer in national associations for teacher education.

As secretary-treasurer first of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and subsequently the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), which he helped create, Dr. Hunt participated directly in the changes sweeping teacher education during the mid-20th century. He worked diligently to develop our national association as the vehicle to stimulate and effect necessary changes in the education of teachers. The tools for change were varied, but of special significance were institutional accreditation, qualitative standards for effective programs, and inclusion of all types of higher education institutions.

When the lecture series honoring him was established in 1960, Dr. Hunt stated:

> In the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, we have come from our varying stations across the nation to share our experience, to pool our strength, and to play our role in the galaxy of institutional organizations which are very important in our national culture. The gradual assembling of all [collegiate] institutions for the preparation of teachers into one working group is a movement of great significance.

Today is the future that Charlie Hunt could only dream about. It is the future his life's work made possible. While I am sure he would applaud our accomplishments, I am equally sure he would urge us to look beyond our horizon, to anticipate the challenges of the future, and to prepare ourselves to meet that future with understanding and enthusiasm.

EDWARD C. POMEROY
Executive Director *emeritus*
AACTE

The conditions of teaching for most teachers across this country are anti-professional. They continue to presume that teachers are semi-skilled workers who implement a curriculum designed by others, receiving knowledge that trickles down from the top of the system in the form of directives, memos, and "teacher-proof" curriculum guides. Such texts and curriculum packages, including some that emerged in the 1980s, are still being used in schools. They not only give the teachers directions for what they should say but the student responses as well, based on a conception that students are standardized, that teaching is predictable and routine, that the teacher's job is to implement something designed outside of the classroom. We are collectively, in concert with teachers, trying to change these conditions.

Those students who are failing in classrooms today are those for whom packaged curriculum will never be successful.

And we must do that not for the sake of teachers but for the sake of students, because it is clear from these many decades of trying to improve education in that way that it simply doesn't work. It doesn't work for kids, it doesn't work for learning, it doesn't produce the kinds of connections between teachers and students around their needs and interests that have to be made. This is particularly true when we deal with the challenge of *all* students learning, not just those who can learn on their own in whatever way information happens to be thrown into their environment, but those for whom the connections that teachers make are the basis upon which their success will rest. Those students who are failing in classrooms today are those for whom packaged curriculum and formulaic teaching will never be successful.

Another result of this tradition of imagining teaching as the implementation of externally-derived prescriptions is that the allocation of resources in U.S. schools is counter-productive. As I was leaving New York City I heard a news report [on an attempt] to count how many of the people employed by the Board of Education in New York City actually teach in classrooms. There are varieties of numbers, thousands of people found on payrolls that had been hidden to view, but the latest reported estimate is that of all of the people employed by the board, only one out of three are teaching children in classrooms.

Nationwide, other data suggest that for every two and a half teachers in schools, we have at least one administrative staff person. That's quite an amazing ratio of oversight. Imagine if we had pupil-teacher ratios of the sort that we have administrator-teacher ratios. What do all of these people do? They write curriculum and tests. They inspect. They supervise. They create reports. They monitor the return of reports. They put data into computers. They report those data back out again. They go into schools sometimes and look at what's going on. Other times they sit at desks and look at numbers that are supposed to tell them what is going on. Is all of this necessary? Does it help education? It is necessary to spend money in our educational system that way only if you presume that, at base, most educators are incompetent and cannot be trusted to make decisions.

In other countries with whom we compare ourselves and sometimes think of ourselves in competition, 80 percent or 90 percent of the resources go directly into teachers in classrooms in schools, because they have adopted a paradigm in which the investment, the primary investment, is in the knowledge and ability of teachers rather than the presumed need for a large superstructure of offices and persons to direct and control the work of teachers. This need for inspectors and directors is eliminated by their initial investment, both through competitive salaries and through extensive and intensive teacher education, and ongoing and systematic mentoring of beginning teachers, that allows them to believe that teachers can be trusted to make knowledgeable decisions. It is this investment in teachers' knowledge that also allows teachers to have the capacity to connect individually and differentially with the needs of learners.

In other countries, 80 or 90 percent of the resources go directly into teachers in classrooms in schools.

We are at a moment in history where we are re-evaluating the conception of the entire education system in this country, and the role of teachers within it, and the role of children within it, and developing a new paradigm in support of more professional, learner-centered teaching. If we are to succeed, teacher educators and teachers must be at the forefront of rethinking how the system operates, and must take leadership in developing learner-centered

standards for preparing teachers. Most of all, they should insist on the use of those standards in preparing teachers. This will allow us to argue with conviction that teachers can be trusted to know what to do. Money can be spent on teaching and learning in classrooms rather than a variety of other ways that not only waste our scarce resources but also create what the Carnegie Forum described as a situation in which "everyone has the brakes and no one has the motors" by which to make schools run well.

The most important standards are standards for teachers...,if we really care about changing the nature and level of student learning.

Over the last few years, the failure of the top-down, bureaucratic approach to transform life in classrooms has become apparent. In recent years, the policy community has come to understand that building the capacity of teachers is the only hope for transforming the nature of teaching and learning in schools in our country. I think this shift is confirmed by new initiatives among governments, foundations, and professional associations to strengthen teacher development efforts, to rethink teacher licensing, along with preservice and inservice education. Among these initiatives are a number of standard-setting activities for students at the national and state levels, and for teachers through organizations like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), NCATE, the state level and professionally-led initiatives of groups like Project 30, the Holmes Group, and others. As this standard-setting "mania" sweeps the country, the most important standards we need to put in place are standards for teachers. In my view, these are even more important than standards for students, if we really care about changing the nature and level of student learning. This is because standards for students are only meaningful if they can be used in the hands of skilled and knowledgeable teachers to produce learning. That will occur only when we get a clear conception of what teachers must know and be able to do, and then put behind it the resources and the investments and the professional development activities that will support those kinds of knowledge and skills for teachers. If we had a profession full of teachers able to connect their knowledge to students' needs,

we would not really need externally-mandated student standards, because teachers would be continually in the process of setting and refining and revamping and activating student standards, both at the classroom level and at levels beyond the classroom.

Standards are useful only to the extent that teachers can use them to build their own knowledge and understanding of what helps students learn. This suggests a whole set of professional development and reflection activities for which standards can be a useful helper, but these do not happen in and of themselves when standards are written on paper. Sometimes policymakers appear to have an image that after we set standards, then all will be right with the world, particularly if we can somehow test to see that they've been achieved. But in fact it is the process of using a set of images about teaching and learning to deepen one's own understanding and that of the teachers and students with whom we work that makes standards useful in any way. And then it is the process of mapping back from those understandings to the necessary investments to ensure we have the resources in the required places so that people can achieve these goals that make the standards come alive. These processes of professional development and investment in resources for learning are frequently overlooked in the dialogue about standards, but I think they are the aspects of the process that are most important.

We have had...standards and evaluation practices for teachers that have not looked at learning very much at all...

I want to set this conversation about the role of standards in educating teachers in the context of what we are trying to do for schools—in the context of school restructuring—where I think the major task is to connect teaching and learning. Because of the factory-model approach to teaching which has tried to mandate prescriptions for practice, we have had images of what teachers do, and standards and evaluation practices for teachers, that have not looked at learning very much at all, but have instead imagined a set of routines or techniques for teaching that are to be demonstrated and checked off in some way, regardless of whether they in fact have any connection to learning. The school restructuring movement and the set of initiatives to rethink, deepen, and strengthen teacher education are transforming this conception of teaching to one that attends more explictly to the act of learning.

We've begun over the last decade to move in both our language and our efforts beyond the idea of school reform—some set of changes to make the system work better—to the idea of school restructuring—some set of initiatives that in fact rethink the overall design and structure of schools and teaching, educational systems, and the profession as a whole. This restructuring is aimed at creating schools that are sufficiently personalized for students that they can have strong ongoing, continuing, and empowering relationships with adults, instead of the depersonalized and dehumanized structures for teaching and learning that have been in place in schools for most of this century.

The process of restructuring is like unraveling an onion—creating a set of conditions which...lead us ultimately to reconceive the entire operation.

Restructuring aims to develop school organizations that can prevent students from falling through the cracks because they spend extensive amounts of time with smaller numbers of teachers over greater numbers of years. Restructured schools also aim to provide a "thinking curriculum" for all students rather than for only about the 10 percent who currently receive it, and a collaborative environment focused on learning and continual improvement for all adults in the school community. They do not assume that the only real work that teachers do is when they are standing up in front of a large group of students presenting information. Obviously, when you begin to work in schools and in teacher education institutions to bring these ideas to life, every change in one part of the organization requires changes elsewhere in the organization, because it's all integrally connected. We can't have a little reform over here, where the curriculum somehow gets changed, without also rethinking how we group adults and students together, how we find time for teachers to work in teams rather than in isolation, how we rethink the school schedule. And all of that also affects our work in teacher education in terms of how we structure work with prospective teachers as well, so that the process of restructuring is like unraveling an onion—creating a set of conditions that affect other conditions which lead us ultimately to reconceive the entire operation.

In the schools where restructuring has been successful, the conception of teaching has broadened substantially. Teachers are no longer responsible for just teaching 10th-grade English, or 7th-grade social studies. They are responsible with a team of their colleagues for a group of students over a long period of time, for really dealing with the needs of the whole student. This conception is occurring even at—God forbid!—the secondary level, where our earlier views of teacher preparation suggested that students cease to develop, or have personal needs, or use different learning styles—they become merely a little bin in which to receive subject-matter information.

Reconceiving what teaching and learning are for kids throughout their school careers creates a demand for many, many kinds of knowledge. Teacher educators are trying to help prospective teachers understand learning and learners in new ways before they enter schools like these, where they will indeed be responsible for students, not just for subjects; for understanding how learning is occurring; for having rich tools to assess how students learn and think and how they perform, as well as what they know. With strong preparation, new teachers will know how to keep a diagnostic eye on the student and his or her learning throughout all of the grades in all the subjects, using lenses of authentic assessment. They will have skills for reaching out to parents from different communities, and creating communication vehicles that are really centered on talk about teaching; and they will have some familiarity with strategies for making decisions together, collaboratively, on behalf of the school.

Reconceiving what teaching and learning are for kids throughout their school careers creates a demand for many, many kinds of knowledge.

Transforming teaching and learning in American schools rests on building those understandings of learning approaches, students' prior knowledge and backgrounds, their communities and their families, that in the past we didn't think of as part of the work of teachers. To the extent that that knowledge of learning differences and assessment were part of the knowledge base, it was usually offered to people when they came back for a master's degree or a doctorate, as they were about to leave the classroom and go on to become a counselor, a curriculum developer, or a measurement

expert. And now we are finding that teachers have to have these kinds of understandings from the very beginning, so they can teach inclusively, and so that they can teach successfully.

Much of the knowledge that is now lodged in different parts of the school of education must be in the hands of teachers because, increasingly, as schools restructure roles and responsibilities, curriculum development, assessment, and decision-making about special needs of students as well as special needs of schools will become the roles and responsibilities of classroom teachers.

The next hurdle is to transform the constraints on our work imposed by a variety of other policies outside of schools of education.

Teacher educators, of course, are involved in building new pedagogies in schools of education, in bringing these kinds of knowledge into the work of preparing teachers, in acting upon understandings of learning as constructed and as dependent on many different intelligences, talents, and approaches, as acquired through inquiry and discovery and experiential work, as well as through more traditional forms of transmission. Increasingly all of us, I think, struggle with ways to make that pedagogy real in our own programs as well as hoping that teachers will use it in the teaching that they do. We have, I think, an understanding that prospective teachers must learn in the way that we hope that they will teach, that the ways in which they experience education and are grouped and are assessed, are the ways in which they will group and assess and shape instruction for their students. School reform creates for us a set of challenges that are exciting and that are being well dispatched in colleges of education across this country.

But the next hurdle is to transform the constraints on our work imposed by a variety of other policies outside of schools of education. Licensing requirements, program approval requirements, and teacher evaluation requirements that beginning teachers confront when they enter teaching—all of these are areas in which standards are set, that influence what can be done in schools of education. In the past, and to a great extent to the present day, these kinds of requirements have not focused on a conception of teaching like the one I have described.

Licensing requirements have focused more on subject-matter knowledge and methods than on a strong understanding of students and their learning. This is especially true for secondary school teachers, who are rarely required to have knowledge about how students learn, develop, think, and perform. Teachers are not generally required by states to be prepared to critically evaluate students' progress in learning in light of knowledge about cognitive, social, physical, and psychological development, multiple intelligences, and diverse performance modes; to develop curriculum grounded in a deep understanding of learning theory and learning differences, or to create and intelligently use assessments that can reveal students' strengths, needs, and understandings. Giving teachers access to such knowledge is also a major part of the transformation of teacher licensing that is on the horizon, a transformation in which teacher educators must play a prominent role in shaping and defining the standards that will in turn shape and define the programs that we are seeking to create and recreate.

Also, preparation for more inclusive practice is missing from the conception of teacher knowledge currently followed by most state licensing systems. Regular classroom teachers, not just those who have some special license or category, need to be prepared to work with students who are linguistically diverse, and have a variety of learning differences and learning difficulties.

Teacher educators must play a prominent role in shaping and defining the standards that will in turn shape and define the programs that we are seeking to create...

These efforts to deepen teacher knowledge are one outgrowth of our efforts to encourage attention to higher-order thinking and performance skills. It's clear that the kind of learning we want from students is going to require a great deal more of teachers than the kind of teaching required to get students to learn in rote/recall fashion. So those two agendas are clearly connected, but they have not yet been fully articulated and pursued, and I think that is the job that lies ahead of us. Here's where standards make a big difference. These new understandings about student learning and the kind of teaching required to facilitate such learning are at odds with many of the widely used strategies for teacher evaluation and management of instruction that have been adopted in school districts across the country.

For example, the Florida Performance Measurement System for beginning teacher evaluation, used not only in Florida but in a number of other states and many districts as well, tallies certain standardized teaching behaviors. These tallies sometimes actually conflict with research on teaching and learning, including the need to connect new ideas to learners' own experiences. Teachers in the Florida system are downgraded; that is, points are taken off, if they ask questions that connect to, or draw upon, students' personal knowledge and experiences, because the rating manual says, "While this is sometimes necessary, it slows the pace of the lesson," which of course is conceived as information transmittal rather than the development of understanding.

[States] have typically not yet examined the implications of these desired changes in practices for teacher learning...

Teachers who are trained to teach to performance evaluation models like this (used in about eight or 10 other states besides Florida) will be unable to succeed on the new National Board assessments for certifying accomplished teachers if they believed what they were doing for the FPMS evaluation and learned it well enough to actually have it shape their ongoing practice. The National Board assessments are grounded in a knowledge base about how children learn and what teaching strategies are needed to support this learning, and they require the kinds of teaching such simplistic models preclude. As the profession moves to create conditions for learner-centered teaching it will need to ferret out outmoded and faulty assumptions about teaching and learning that are built into a variety of policies, programs, and instruments that have been developed or adopted in states and school districts across this country. This is part of what we must attend to, even while we attend to the work within our institutions.

Because state legislatures and agencies have fashioned licensing policies and testing requirements and approval guidelines at various points in time, often in a fragmented fashion, they are not even always consistent with one another in terms of the conception of teaching they embody or the kinds of preparation they seek to inspire, even within a given state. So it is important now to be about the business of creating a strong and coherent system as states

undergo reforms of elementary and secondary education that influence curriculum, teaching, and assessment for students. They have not yet typically examined the implications of these desired changes in practices for teacher learning, and that translation and understanding are things that we need to be working on so that they are accomplished in a way that takes full account of what teachers need to know and be able to do, translated into meaningful assessments for licensing and new processes for state program accountability, and closing loopholes to licensing, so that we, as a profession, take a stand on the fact that all children matter.

Teaching, as you know, is the only licensed occupation out of some 800 in which new entrants can come in without having mastered a common knowledge base. Across this country, 46 states still allow emergency certification for teachers when they cannot fill vacancies at the wages currently offered. More than 30 have alternative certification routes which sometimes require as little as two or three weeks of training prior to entering a classroom and taking full charge as teacher of record, generally unmentored. And the 50,000 or more teachers who come in annually under these routes teach almost exclusively in the low-income and minority schools, almost exclusively in central cities and poor rural areas. No matter how much we do to improve the quality of education teacher education institutions provide and the standards that we apply to ourselves, we have not taken a stand on the question of whether all children matter if we do not address the issue of whether all teachers must be prepared to teach in responsible ways in all communities. And that's a part of the issue of professionalizing teaching and dealing with the standards that affect all of the members of the occupation as well.

Competence and caring are the foundations of professional accountability.

The strength and legitimacy of any profession depends on the continued growth and development of its members. Because competence and caring are the foundations of professional accountability, it is extremely important to have effective mechanisms within all of our professional organizations that help inform practitioners about their work and provide opportunity for consultation,

reflection, self-assessment, and continued improvement. Professional control of an occupation—who enters, what constitutes good practice, who remains—of course is a tenet central to creating an accountable profession. Our willingness to set and use meaningful standards to guide practice and create a variety of strategies for peer review of practice is at the core of our ability to live up to the tenets of a profession—to commit itself not only to a knowledge base and the transfer or use of that knowledge base, but to the best interests of the clients whom the profession serves.

The point of standards is not just to get them somehow written down but to use them as a lens in programs in schools.

For the first time in the history of teaching, the substance of teaching standards is coming under the control of the profession and being accomplished in a way that involves serious participation of teachers. For most of our history, standard-setting has been outside the hands of the profession, in the hands of state agencies or commercial testing companies, a practice that stands in contrast to standard-setting in every other profession. It is critical for us to be involved not only in developing but also using professionally grounded standards.

The point of standards such as those being established by the National Board and the INTASC group is not just to get them somehow written down but to use them as a lens for assessing teaching in schools and schools of education—for examining practices and programs, for reflecting on goals and strategies, for questioning what we are doing and how it is working, and, ultimately, for growing and changing and revising the standards themselves. They are dynamic and living. They must be continually reshaped as we learn more. They are tools for the peer review strategies that we are putting in place both in restructured schools and in schools of education. They should also point toward needs for investments. Administrators and policymakers must take seriously the question, "How do we get there from here?" How do we invest in strengthening teacher education, programs which on almost every campus produce more revenues for the universities than they retain for the education of their own students, programs which on most campuses in fact spend less money than any other major or department on the

campus? How do we make the case, both in public arenas and university campuses, for adequate investments for the kind of preparation that will enable us to enact the standards that are being developed and revised?

Until recently, there were not clearly articulated standards of practice, defined and accepted by the profession. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, established in 1987 to begin this important task, is the very first professional body in teaching to take on standard-setting with predominant membership of educators—teachers and teacher educators—among the two-thirds practicing teachers on the Board.

The National Board standards have several important attributes. Developed by highly accomplished educators, they produce and reflect an image of teaching radically different from that represented in any other teacher assessment or evaluation activity. They reflect teachers' understanding that teaching is intense activity, that it requires juggling of subject matter, cognitive goals, and social goals; management of time, materials, and equipment; and the needs and responses of individual students. It takes seriously the constant decisions that teachers must make. Is Susie ready to learn some grammatical conventions for her writing, or will that discourage her from her next effort? What's going on with Joe? Why is he so withdrawn at the moment? How can I find some time to work with him while I have the rest of the group productively engaged? What is the source of Mary's difficulty with division of fractions? What strategy can I use to address her misconceptions? Thousands of these decisions every day, not talliable on a simple checklist, but understandable as experts look at the teaching of other teachers, and understand the judgments and considerations that are undertaken in making those decisions and in teaching in ways that take the student and his or her learning into account.

The complexity of teaching, the balancing of goals, and the simultaneity of ongoing tasks have been absent from assessment practices in the past.

These aspects of the complexity of teaching, the balancing of goals, and the simultaneity of ongoing tasks have been absent from assessment practices in the past. However, as teachers are now involved in setting professional standards, we see assessments that

can reflect the real complexities and real judgments that teachers must make, the ability to grab the teachable moment, to adapt to students as they respond, that really makes for good teaching. It is this capacity that I think the National Board assessments begin to tap in a very important way and that our work in developing standards for state licensing and teacher preparation programs must also begin to tap, as educators assume more and more responsibility for developing those assessments themselves rather than having them developed by non-educators and then complaining about how they don't reflect what it is we are trying to do. This is critically important as an area of work for all of us.

As teachers are now involved in setting professional standards, we see assessments that can reflect the real judgments that teachers must make.

The National Board assessments involve teachers collecting artifacts of their work and demonstrating their ability to perform certain of their activities, assembling evidence in a portfolio that they develop over the course of a year. The portfolio includes actual teacher work and work of students, lesson plans, samples of assignments, reflections on those materials, and reflections on students' work collected over time, looking at the interaction between teaching and student learning. And what does this piece of work tell me about what the student knows and needs? And what do I do about that? And then a representation of the teacher's work, and then a representation of the student's work, in an interactive fashion. The assessments represent what we know the real stuff of teaching to be like, the planning and reflection, and that understanding and analysis that teachers go through, along with videotapes of classroom teaching events.

This kind of assessment, and these kinds of standards, enable teachers and others who look at their teaching to assess their thinking and performance in a complex way that actually takes into account their intentions, their decision-making, their students, and their effects as well as their actions in the classroom.

In developing the portfolios, teachers allege over and over again that it's the most powerful professional development activity they undertake. One of the teachers, Lucretia Pinòzo, who went through the English Language Arts assessment in a pilot for the

National Board assessments, said:

> Unlike the other certifications I've completed, this one required tremendous self-reflection and self-analysis, and while the requirements were not necessarily outside the realm of the usual work of my teaching, the field test experience increased the intensity of my thinking about my work, and had impact on my teaching both during the assessment process and after.

She gave three examples.

> First, the video made me aware of my role in the classroom, whether I dominated the group or whether I allowed time for student interaction and talking. Now, when I approach a class I consider these lessons of observation so that I can measure my performance in the classroom. Second, while my particular school has a lot of high achievers, we fall somewhat short in the area of multicultural education. Now, I am more attuned to this particular shortcoming. I try to choose different books and broaden my lessons to improve students' education in this area. Third, teachers were asked to accumulate the writing of two students and then write reflective commentaries about the writing samples. I had accumulated folders of work of several students and I took notes about observations and lessons from the course of the three months. In documenting student work, I became aware of the benefits of such scrupulous attention to student development over time."

She goes on to talk about how one of those two students' parents actually came in for a conference shortly after she had done this analysis, and how very impressed they were at the way in which she and they could understand and look at their son's writing and progress.

Our goal must be to create, use, reflect upon, operationalize, and enliven standards in a way that produces learning...

The point is that it is in the use of those standards and reflecting on one's own practice that they come alive and become useful for learning, not just for assessment. As we map those standards into licensing arenas as well, as we use them in teacher education, as we move into an era where those kinds of portfolios for assessing prospective teacher learning, start in schools of education and continue into an internship year, our goal must be to create, use, reflect upon, operationalize, and enliven standards in a way that produces learning. They are not there

primarily for just setting cut-offs, and screening and sorting people. They are there as learning tools for all of us, as powerful ways for teachers to take charge of their own development and reflecting on their own practice, and for teacher educators to do the same. The day will come, I think, where teacher educators will be National Board-certified themselves, as well as using those assessments in their practice with prospective teachers, and using related assessments that are developed for licensing and for the accreditation of teacher education programs. Teacher educators will use these standards for their own reflection and learning as well as for the reflection and learning of individual teachers. As these standards demonstrate a reflective, student-centered, and problem-solving orientation, we may be able to create a world in which not only a small number of teachers with special titles have special knowledge, but a world in which all teachers, who work with all students, have in their hands the capacity to understand what each of those students needs—to create for themselves ongoing learning and reflection and assessment opportunities, on behalf of their students as well as their own professional development and growth.

As we prepare teachers to go into schools, the lens through which all of the practice occurs is a lens that is focused on teachers' capacity to serve students.

The two commitments that I mentioned earlier—to enhancement of equity and to enhancement of teacher education in the cause of school reform—should propel us to imagine ways in which the use of such tools can provide a means for imagining what can go on in restructured schools that we work in. As we prepare teachers to go into schools, whether those are professional development schools or whether they are other kinds of settings for the student teaching and internship experiences of prospective teachers, the lens through which all of the practice occurs is a lens that is focused on teachers' capacity to serve students, not teachers' capacity to exhibit the behaviors that will get checked off on a list which closes their minds toward reflection and internal assessment. That preparation for practice should be occurring in schools where the greatest need is, in the schools where students may otherwise be less well served, in schools where teachers can work with the range of students they must be prepared to work with, where state-of-the-art practice is

guided by the use of professionally developed standards rather than where people are coping and getting by and having real-world experiences that teach them to give up rather than to move forward.

Probably the most important recognition in setting some vision for what teachers ought to be able to know and do, and rethinking our practices in line with those ideals, is that our prospective teachers will learn, as their students must learn, by inquiring into problems, by trying and testing ideas, by evaluating and reflecting on the outcomes of their work as beginning teachers, just as we do as teacher educators. As experienced teachers work together on real problems of practice in learner-centered settings through the lens of a vision of teaching that can inspire ongoing learning and reflection, we develop a collective knowledge base, along with ownership and participation in developing a common set of understandings about practice that we will continually use as a frame for our practice, and continually revise and revamp for ourselves and for our colleagues throughout the course of an entire career.

This kind of development, this kind of work among teachers that builds shared knowledge, that builds shared norms of practice, as well as grows a profession-wide understanding of effective practice, can lead us as well to the development of a profession, to a profession that can take ownership and leadership for creating and using an expanding base of knowledge to serve all children well. I think this is the shared goal of school reform and of teacher preparation, and one that we now have a genuine opportunity—and a serious obligation—to achieve on behalf of all the nation's schoolchildren. ■

Linda Darling-Hammond, the 34th Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecturer, is William F. Russell Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University (N.Y.) and codirector of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST).

One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
TEL: (202) 293-2450
FAX: (202) 457-8095